

only because the numbers of young men taken in recent months have been sharply reduced. In each of the first 3 months of the year, eighty thousand were called. That was highly unpopular. In April and May the call was for forty thousand. In June the number was dropped still further, to twenty thousand, and for July to fifteen thousand. The August figure has already been set at twenty-two thousand.

Now that the bill has been approved and public opinion can no longer have any influence on the voting, the call can be expected to climb just as rapidly as it fell while the bill was under consideration.

This Congress has not yet given Mr. Truman everything he has asked by way of economic controls but it is heading in that direction. When he has made a few more promises to deal gently with the productive apparatus of the country, Congress can be expected to vote him the authorizations he desires, and then he can get as tough with his subjects as he chooses.

Congress made a feeble show of protecting the Nation's interest in the bill for wheat to India but, in the end, folded up as it has many times before.

The record of the Eighty-second Congress would invite the conclusion that Mr. Truman's policies are popular, that the people are delighted with his Korean War, crave increases in their tax bills, and want their sons drafted for foreign wars. Evidently, the majority of the Members have lost touch with the people they represent.

The Conflict Between Communism and Democracy in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1951

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the Egyptian Ambassador to the United States delivered an excellent address at Princeton University, on June 2. While I do not wish to approve or disapprove the views of this distinguished gentleman, his message should be read with much care and interest by those who wish to be informed on the political, economic and social problems of the Near East. Certainly all Americans covet the friendship and understanding of these ancient and honorable people. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I offer the Ambassador's address for insertion in the RECORD:

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN COMMUNISM AND DEMOCRACY IN THE NEAR EAST

INTRODUCTION

I am deeply grateful for your kind invitation to open the discussion on the question of how the people of the Near East feel with regard to the conflict between east and west. The keen interest in the Near East manifested by this country in recent years is most reassuring to those of us who are anxious to encourage closer cooperation between it and the western democracies.

Much credit for stimulating interest in the problems of the Near East is due to seminars and discussions like these held annually by the Department of Oriental Languages and Literatures of Princeton University. And you, Professor Hitti, are to be congratulated for the pioneer work that

you have done and are still doing in this important field.

This subject of discussion is certainly of great importance, especially at this moment when the Near East is a hot spot in world politics. From the Indian Ocean to the shores of the Atlantic, from the Caspian Sea to the Arabian Desert, the political atmosphere is heavily charged. It is no exaggeration to say that if we regard Europe as a tinder box of possible world war, the Near East must be regarded as a great smoldering volcano.

On account of the gravity of the situation and the importance of the question, and for the sake of frankness, I would like to talk off the record. "Let us seek the truth because there is nothing so powerful as truth and often nothing so strange."

GEOGRAPHICAL DEFINITION OF AREA DISCUSSED

Here I would like to define the area of the Near East. When I speak of the Near East in this paper I mean the Arab countries of Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Lebanon, Syria and Iraq, as well as Iran. I add to this area North Africa—Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco—although geographically they are nearer to Europe. Racially, religiously and socially these countries are related to and form a part of the Near East. I exclude Turkey from the discussion because Turkey has more or less associated herself with Europe and this alliance is further strengthened by its participation in the European Council and its possible admittance into the North Atlantic Pact organization. Turkey's present situation is quite different from that of the other countries of the Near East. It receives economic and military help from the Western Powers. The other people of the Near East, who have always been connected with Turkey are happy that it is receiving this aid, which it deserves, as they consider it a bulwark against communism.

IMPORTANCE AND VULNERABILITY OF THE AREA

The Near East, as I define it, has a population of about 100,000,000. It is not an area merely of oriental costumes and glamour, of soft music, of romantic deserts, of the pyramids and the sphinx, as some motion pictures have so vividly presented it. It is a land of great historical past, of vital strategic importance, and of awakening nations struggling to achieve liberty and a greater measure of democracy. It is a land of great potentialities and natural resources. It has the world's largest oil pool and rich deposits of phosphate, magnesium, and potash.

Its strategic importance has always been recognized and was amply demonstrated in World Wars I and II. The North African coast from the Atlantic to Suez is so naturally protected by two seas and extensive deserts that it is considered by strategists as indispensable for the defense of Europe. The present situation in Iran is focusing attention on the strategic importance of this area. The testimony of General Bradley before the Joint Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees bears witness to that.

The name of the Near East is synonymous with Islam. Islam is a democratic religion based on the freedom of the individual and on the principle of liberty, equality, and justice for all, regardless of race or station in life. While communism is based on the abolition of private property, the economic policy of Islam is based on the maintenance of private property. While communism abolishes the right of inheritance, Islam upholds this right and provides precise rules to regulate it.

The people of the Near East are staunch believers in God and for this reason they do not fear the loss of their livelihood; they have a deep-rooted feeling that God cares for all and that He is the only Giver. They also believe that Almighty God in His great

wisdom has distributed wealth and the amenities of life amongst the people and that while they should work and toil for gain and security they should also not covet what others have. Also, one of the five basic principles of Islam is Zakah, which is a form of tax paid by the rich and which can be increased by competent Moslem authorities according to the needs of society. The revenue of this tax goes toward the welfare of the poor and the raising of their standard of living. Society in the Near East, both Moslem and Christian, is built upon these principles.

An area with such great potentialities can certainly be a mighty bulwark against communism. Yet these potentialities remain neglected by the west, and no attempt is being made to use Islam as a spiritual weapon against communism.

What makes this neglect lamentable is the fact that the area is extremely vulnerable. And the Communists, who obviously covet the Near East, know that it is highly vulnerable, not only from the military point of view, but also from the political and, worse still, from the psychological points of view.

WESTERN POLICY IN THE NEAR EAST

Not only has the west neglected the potentialities of the Near East, but its policy toward it has not been the kind that would rally the peoples of the area around the flag of democracy.

At the close of the Second World War the Near East was very friendly to the United States and her allies. Today a spirit of resentment and even revolt against the western democracies is sweeping this area. In Iran, Iraq, and Egypt a determined stand has been taken against the British. The people of Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia are struggling against French rule. Everywhere in the area there is resentment against the west.

What is the reason behind this change of attitude? What is the reason behind the indifference of the peoples of the Near East toward the conflict raging between the east and west? The reason is not difficult to find: It is the policy followed by the west in this area, which has been skillfully exploited by the Communists. Let us make a brief survey of this policy:

PALESTINE POLICY ALIENATED PEOPLE

The Palestine question is an outstanding example of this policy. Everyone knows that the serious injustice inflicted upon the Arabs in Palestine has alienated them and undermined the stability of the area.

The west's continued political and financial support of the Zionists in Palestine is not helping the relations with the Near East, nor is it strengthening the forces which are fighting communism there.

The failure to solve the problem of the Palestine refugees and the persistent refusal of the Zionists to implement the U. N. resolutions has given communism a better weapon than it ever dreamed of having. What better soil can communism have for planting its seeds of sedition and revolution than that represented by a million dispossessed, disillusioned, frustrated, homeless, and hungry human beings?

WESTERN POLICY IN NEAR EAST IS MAINLY COLONIAL

Another example of the western policy that has alienated the people of the Near East is the colonial system pursued by some of the western democracies in this area. When I speak of colonial policy I mean its two aspects—the political and the economic. Colonialism, the old and familiar enemy against which the United States fought in 1776, is one of the main reasons for the alienation of the near eastern people from western democracies.

Foreign troops are stationed in Iraq and Jordan against the will of their people.

Since 1882, and in violation of the lofty principles proclaimed in the two World Wars, and of the United Nations Charter, foreign troops still occupy the Suez Canal in Egypt. This violation of the territorial integrity of Egypt is ever present in the mind of every Egyptian, and is causing ever-increasing resentment and unrest. Foreign troops also occupy the Sudan, the southern province of Egypt, from which flows the Nile, the life line of Egypt. This enforced separation of the Sudan from Egypt is the cause of still more bitter resentment among Egyptians and Sudanese alike.

If we go westward along the North African coast, we find 25,000,000 inhabitants in Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco, still subjugated by colonialism. In this, our twentieth century, they are denied the right of self-determination and self-government. In Libya, whose independence and unity were recognized and guaranteed by the United Nations, we find that everything is being done by colonial powers to destroy this unity and to undermine this independence by dividing this small nation of 1,000,000 inhabitants into 3 tiny countries—Cyrenaica, Tripoli, and Fezzan. This is tantamount to the abolition of their unity and independence.

What is happening in Iran is a classic example of a collision between economic colonialism and awakening nationalism. In this critical area, an explosion may be the possible aftermath.

STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF BOTH PARTIES

Having briefly reviewed the policy followed by the western democracies in the Near East, I would like to say a word about the strategy and tactics followed by the Communists, as compared to those followed by the western democracies.

COMMUNIST STRATEGY

We all know that the Communists aim at world revolution and to achieve this aim they are ready to use all forces and motives which lead even for a moment in the direction of this aim. For the Communists the present world situation is the continuation of a long succession of events. They base their policy on wars, unrest, and disorder growing out of the explosive forces of modern society.

Their greatest asset in the Near East, on which they capitalize, is the political and colonial policy followed in this area. In proof of this, let me quote to you extracts from a series of lectures, On the Foundation of the Principles of Leninism, given by Stalin in 1924 in Sverdlov University:

"The national movements for the freeing of the oppressed countries from the imperialist yoke certainly contain unexhausted revolutionary possibilities which can be utilized for the overthrow of our common enemy, for the destruction of imperialism. For these causes, the proletariat must decisively and actually support the national movements for the liberation of the oppressed and dependent people." Stalin concludes his lecture with the following poignant declaration: "One of the chief indirect reserves for the Communist revolution is antagonisms, conflicts, and wars."

In other words, the Communist plan in the Near East is to fan up nationalist movements and exploit the evils of the colonial policy in order to foment trouble and unrest that will lead ultimately to world revolution and the seizure of power. This is precisely what the Communists are doing in Palestine, Iran, and the rest of the Near East.

They are not fomenting class struggles nor advocating agrarian or other economic reforms, but they are inciting political trouble. They do not call their parties in the Near East Communist parties; they call them committees of national liberation. They do not work and direct their pernicious propaganda toward the peasant and worker

but toward the intellectual elements and university students, knowing that these are the leaders of nationalist movements in these countries.

WESTERN STRATEGY COMPARED TO COMMUNIST STRATEGY

This, then, is the strategy of the Communists. Let us look at the strategy of the west.

Lincoln said: "If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it." Let us then see where we are in the Near East and whither we are tending in relation to communism.

The Communists are well led. They are using the most effective weapons and are being guided by well-defined aims. The Western Powers, on the other hand, while fighting for freedom and democracy elsewhere, continue to pursue the outworn concepts of imperialism. They seem to think that they can combat communism chiefly with loans, grants, and technical assistance.

There is no denying that we have in the Near East internal problems which favor the growth of communism. Our economic system is by no means perfect: The distribution of wealth is inequitable and the standard of living of the masses is low. The near eastern countries are endeavoring to solve these problems in the traditional way: graduated taxes and social reforms.

My own country, for one, has already made some strides in this direction. A new graduated income and inheritance tax has been in force for 3 years. The rural centers established by my government to improve the health and living conditions of the peasants and to increase their income have been hailed by U. N. experts and recommended as models to other countries. Our social-security program has likewise been highly praised.

Several reforms are under way in the area. Given peace, security, and some encouragement, the Near East can overcome these economic and social difficulties. We are greatly encouraged by the helpful attitude of this noble country. Some technical assistance has been given and the United States is now considering economic aid for our area. But this alone will not prevent the march of communism.

The western democracies talk about raising the standard of living and the better distribution of wealth as preventive measures against communism. The Communists in the Near East, however, are not inciting people against the established economic order. They are not using poverty and the low standard of living as weapons to foment unrest and confusion as a prelude to world revolution. They have tried them without success. They are using the more effective weapons—Palestine and colonialism—gratuitously furnished to them by the Western Powers.

In the Near East the cancer of communism is feeding upon colonialism. Eradicate this and the Near East will be yours. If the western democracies confine themselves to treating the Near East with economic aid alone the situation will not improve. The only remedy, in my opinion, is to grant the people of the Near East their lawful rights of independence, both economic and political.

NATIONAL MOVEMENT AGAINST XENOPHOBIA

In the Near East there is a strong nationalist movement. Spurred on by communism, it is gaining speed and momentum daily.

Some people call this movement xenophobia. Is it xenophobia for the people who own the oil fields and are in extremely needy circumstances to demand their proper share of the profit, or even control of their resources? Is it xenophobia for Egypt to ask for the withdrawal of foreign troops from her territory and the restoration of the unity of the Sudan with Egypt? Is it xenophobia for

Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia to ask for liberation from foreign rule?

Our people are struggling to achieve liberty and a greater measure of democracy, struggling to free themselves of foreign domination, colonialism, and exploitation—the very same objectives which brought about this country's independence.

It was America that started the revolution against imperialism—a revolution which has not yet stopped and will not stop until all mankind is free. It is of the utmost importance that the West should recognize these national movements and formulate its policy accordingly.

PRESENT ATTITUDE OF THE PEOPLE OF THE NEAR EAST

Now what is the present attitude of the Near East with regard to the conflict between the East and the West? The persistence of the western powers in following their present policy has left the area exposed to Communist penetration, and totally unprepared, both morally and militarily to face the coming conflict.

While the West is just beginning to fight this penetration by the ineffective and slow method of economic and technical assistance, the Communists are scoring by using effectively the deadly weapon of colonialism.

The people of the Near East are naturally opposed to communism, but owing to their disappointment in the western policy they are moving in the direction of neutrality in the conflict between East and West. This attitude was clearly outlined in a resolution adopted by the Arab League during its Cairo meeting in February 1951:

"The Arab States hasten to express their belief in the principles of the United Nations Organization * * * but it goes without saying that the Arab States cannot carry out the grave international obligations imposed by the U. N. Charter on all nations without their gaining their complete national rights and the settling of their national questions in accordance with the principles of freedom, justice, and equality."

This is the predominant feeling in the vital Near East and this is the picture, a picture by no means bright or reassuring. If things are left drifting as they are, tragedies similar to that in Iran may take place. Isn't it wiser to take immediate steps to remedy the situation before it is too late?

The remedy is simple. It lies in the adoption by the west of a new liberal policy that bridges the wide gulf separating it from the people of the Near East; a policy that will satisfy their national aspirations—political or economic; a policy that will deprive the Communists of their best weapon—colonialism. Then communism will have no place in the Near East.

The Near East has been for thousands of years the world's arena, an arena of armies and of ideologies.

History is repeating itself. This area is now a battleground for the greatest struggle in history and the Near East is about to play its traditional role once more.

We, the people of the Near East, believe that we can win the battle of freedom if a policy based on true democracy is followed by the west in our area.

Arms alone will not achieve final victory. You cannot destroy an idea with a bomb. But you can make people throw an idea into discard by giving them a better one. The idea that offers humanity the best chance for peace, security, and happiness will prevail in the end.

Democracy offers this chance. But democracy must be put into practice. To sell it you must put it to work, not only at home but abroad also.

The Near East is an ideal spot to put democracy into practice and to show the world what it can do. The challenge of the Near East is both real and great and the rewards are immensely rich.